



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,203	08/18/2003	Jeffrey E. Stahmann	GUID.059PA	4057
51294 7590 09/22/2008 HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC 8009 34TH AVE S. SUITE 125 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55425				
EXAMINER				
DINGA, ROLAND				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3766				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,203

Applicant(s)

STAHMANN ET AL.

Examiner

ROLAND DINGA

Art Unit

3766

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 61-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 61-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

07/12/2004, 03/03/2005, 06/18/2007, 09/24/2007, 06/23/2008.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II in the reply filed on 06/23/2008 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 61-65,67-86,88,90-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Florio (US 2004/0002742).

Regarding **claim 61**, Florio discloses a medical device, comprising: a detector system (244 or 246) configured to detect patient conditions [see fig.2]; a disordered breathing detection system (238) coupled to the detector system and configured to detect disordered breathing [see fig.2]; a therapy control system (220) coupled to the disordered breathing detection system (238) and the detector system (244 &246) and configured to adapt a cardiac electrical therapy to mitigate the disordered breathing [see fig.2]; and a therapy delivery system (240,240) coupled to the therapy control system and configured to deliver the adapted therapy to the patient, wherein at least one of the detector system (244 & 246) includes an implantable component [see fig.2].

Regarding **claim 62**, at least two of the detector system (244 or 246), the disordered breathing detection system (238) include implantable components [fig.2].

Regarding **claim 63**, at least three of the disordered breathing detection system (238), the detector system (244 & 246) and the therapy delivery system (240,245) include implantable components [fig.2].

Regarding **claim 64**, the therapy delivery system (240,245) includes implantable components [fig.2].

Regarding **claim 65**, detector system comprises a patient-internal sensor 244[see fig.2].

Regarding **claim 67**, the telemetry unit is capable of being used by the patient.

Regarding **claim 68**, the disordered breathing detection system (238) includes a wirelessly connected component (254 & 264)[see fig.2].

Regarding **claim 69**, the disordered breathing detection system (238) is inherently configured to detect a respiration pattern of one or more respiration cycles, determine one or more characteristics of the respiration pattern, and classify the respiration pattern as disordered breathing based on the one or more characteristics of the respiration pattern [fig.2].

Regarding **claims 70-92**, the therapy control system (220) is inherently configured to adapt the specified since the device allows reprogramming of the control system and thus is configured to be adaptable to whatever needs. In addition, no particular stimulation regimen is specified for the therapy or the

needs of the particular patient thus one therapy make work for one patient and not another.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 66, 87, 89, 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florio (US 2004/0002742) as applied to claim 61 above.

Regarding **claim 66**, Florio discloses the invention substantially as claimed but failed to disclose a patient-external sensor. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Florio device with the external sensor, since such a modification would provide the predictable results of having a less invasive and can be worn or used by the sleep apnea patient only at times when the intention or expectation is to sleep.

Regarding **claim 87**, Florio discloses the invention substantially as claimed but failed to disclose that the therapy control system is configured to adapt the

therapy to mitigate hypopnea or mitigate Cheyne-Stokes respiration. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Florio device to the therapy control system is configured to adapt the therapy to mitigate hypopnea or mitigate Cheyne-Stokes respiration since it is well known (e.g US2002/0193697, US2003/0153954) in the art.

Regarding **claim 89**, Florio discloses the invention substantially as claimed but failed to disclose that the therapy delivery system is configured to deliver bi-ventricular pacing therapy. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Florio device to deliver bi-ventricular pacing therapy, since such a technique is well known (e.g.US6477420) in the art.

Regarding **claim 93**, Florio discloses that invention substantially as claimed but failed to disclose that the therapy delivery system is configured to deliver multi-site pacing. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Florio device to deliver multi-site pacing, since such a technique is well known (e.g.US6292693) in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROLAND DINGA whose telephone number is (571)270-

3644. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am to 5:00pm EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl H. Layno can be reached on 571 272 4949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/RD/ PATENT EXAMINER
09/03/2008

/Mark W Bockelman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3766